UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/807,366	04/12/2001	Mary Vijayarani Barnabas	7312M	7246

27752 7590 03/01/2004

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DIVISION
WINTON HILL TECHNICAL CENTER - BOX 161
6110 CENTER HILL AVENUE
CINCINNATI, OH 45224

EXAMINER	
KUMAR, PREETI	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1751	

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/807,366	BARNABAS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Preeti Kumar	1751	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *02 December 2003*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *49-88* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *49-88* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Final Rejection

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-48 are canceled.

2. Newly added claims 49-88 are pending.

3. The terminal disclaimer filed December 2, 2003 for prior patent no. 6,001,343 has been accepted.

4. The rejection of claims 1-44 under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-41 of U.S. Patent No. 6,001,343 is withdrawn in light of applicant's terminal disclaimer.

5. The rejection of claims 1-44 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite is withdrawn in light of applicant's cancellation of the claims.

6. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trinh et al. (US 6,001,343) in light of applicant's cancellation of the claims..

7. The rejection of claims 1, 4, and 6-44 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Burzio et al. (US 5,496,494) in light of applicant's cancellation of the claims.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

New Grounds of Rejection

Claim Objections

9. Claim 69 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 69 does not further limit claim 49.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

10. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

11. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Support for the inclusion of the limitation,"...wherein the oligosachharide has a degree of polymerization from 1 to about 15 ..." is not provided by applicant's in the remarks and the specification provides no basis for this limitation. Applicant is required to specify page number and line number reciting support or amend the claim to comply with the written description.

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. Claims 49-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claims 49-88, the phrase "and/or" render the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d). Also, the term "essentially" in claim 49 is a relative term which renders the claim indefinite. The term "essentially" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. Finally, it appears that applicants have not written the claimed limitations in proper English and all of the claims have improperly placed prepositional phrases. Just as an example, Claim 49 reads, " A fabric care composition comprising an effective amount to provide a fabric with at least one of the following fabric care benefits:..." but does not recite an effective amount of what? For examination purposes, the examiner is assuming that claim 49 is drawn to an effective amount of a composition comprising oligosaccharides and cyclodextrin. Support for this assumption is found in components A (line 6) and B the only non-optional components of claim 49.

Claim 70 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted elements are: the specific salts of metals that the applicant is referring to in claim 70.

Regarding claim 87, a broad range or limitation together with a narrow range or limitation that falls within the broad range or limitation (in the same claim) is considered indefinite, since the resulting claim does not clearly set forth the metes and bounds of the patent protection desired. Note the explanation given by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences in *Ex parte Wu*, 10 USPQ2d 2031, 2033 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989), as to where broad language is followed by "preferably" and then narrow language. The Board stated that this can render a claim indefinite by raising a question or doubt as to whether the feature introduced by such language is (a) merely exemplary of the remainder of the claim, and therefore not required, or (b) a required feature of the claims. Note also, for example, the decisions of *Ex parte Steigewald*, 131 USPQ 74 (Bd. App. 1961); *Ex parte Hall*, 83 USPQ 38 (Bd. App. 1948); and *Ex parte Hasche*, 86 USPQ 481 (Bd. App. 1949). In the present instance, claim 87 recites the broad recitation 0.005% to about 4%, and the claim also recites 0.01% to about 2%, and the claim also recites 0.05% to about 1% which is the narrower statement of the range/limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

14. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

17. Claims 49-51, 54-76, 78-88,are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Trinh et al. (US 6,001,343).

The applied reference has a common inventor and assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Trinh et al. teach a stable, aqueous odor-absorbing and wrinkle controlling composition, preferably for use on inanimate surfaces, especially fabrics. The composition comprises from about 0.1% to about 20%, by weight of the composition, of solubilized, water-soluble, uncomplexed cyclodextrin and an effective amount of at least one ingredient to improve the performance of the composition selected from the group consisting of: (1) cyclodextrin compatible surfactant; (2) cyclodextrin compatible antimicrobial active; and (3) mixtures thereof. The composition also comprises a wrinkle control agent which is fabric lubricant, shape retention polymer, hydrophilic plasticizer, lithium salt, or mixtures thereof. Hydrophilic perfume improves acceptance. Optionally, the composition can contain low molecular weight polyols; metallic salts to help control odor; a humectant, etc. The composition is essentially free of any material that would soil or stain fabric. The composition is preferably applied as small particle size droplets, especially from spray containers. The cyclodextrin/surfactant combination, either alone, or in combination with the other ingredients, provides improved antimicrobial activity. See abstract.

Specifically regarding claims 49-51 and 54-59, Trinh et al. teach cyclodextin derivatives have a degree of substitution of from about 1 to 14. See col8, ln.50-55. Trinh et al. teach a preferred class of cyclodextrin-compatible nonionic surfactants are

the polyalkylene oxide polysiloxanes having a dimethyl polysiloxane hydrophobic moiety and one or more hydrophilic polyalkylene side chains, and having the general formula:

R.sup.1 --(CH.sub.3).sub.2 SiO--[(CH.sub.3).sub.2 SiO].sub.a --[(CH.sub.3)(R.sup.1)SiO].sub.b --Si(CH.sub.3).sub.2 --R.sup.1 wherein a+b are from about 1 to about 50, preferably from about 3 to about 30, more preferably from about 10 to about 25, and each R.sup.1 is the same or different and is selected from the group consisting of methyl and a poly(ethyleneoxide/propyleneoxide) copolymer group having the general formula:

--(CH.sub.2).sub.n O(C.sub.2 H.sub.4 O).sub.c (C.sub.3 H.sub.6 O).sub.d R.sup.2 with at least one R.sup.1 being a poly(ethyleneoxide/propyleneoxide) copolymer group, and wherein n is 3 or 4, preferably 3; total c (for all polyalkyleneoxy side groups) has a value of from 1 to about 100, total d is from 0 to about 14, total c+d has a value of from about 5 to about 150, and each R.sup.2 is the same or different and is selected from the group consisting of hydrogen, an alkyl having 1 to 4 carbon atoms, and an acetyl group, preferably hydrogen and methyl group. Each polyalkylene oxide polysiloxane has at least one R.sup.1 group being a poly(ethyleneoxide/propyleneoxide) copolymer group. Trinh et al. teach cyclodextrin compatible silicone to impart a lubricating property to the fabric. See col.28-30 in their entirety. Trinh et al. teach that "silicone" as used herein preferably refers to emulsified and/or microemulsified silicones, including those that are commercially available and those that are emulsified and/or microemulsified in the composition, unless otherwise described. Some non-limiting examples of silicones which are useful in the present invention are: non-volatile silicone fluids such as

polydimethyl siloxane gums and fluids; volatile silicone fluid which can be a cyclic silicone fluid of the formula [(CH.sub.3).sub.2 SiO].sub.n where n ranges between about 3 to about 7, preferably about 5, or a linear silicone polymer fluid having the formula (CH.sub.3).sub.3 SiO[(CH.sub.3).sub.2 SiO].sub.m Si(CH.sub.3).sub.3 where m can be 0 or greater and has an average value such that the viscosity at 25.degree. C. of the silicone fluid is preferably about 5 centistokes or less. Thus one type of silicone that is useful in the composition of the present invention is polyalkyl silicone with the following structure: A--(Si(R.sub.2)--O--[Si(R.sub.2)--O--].sub.q --Si(R.sub.2)--A

The alkyl groups substituted on the siloxane chain (R) or at the ends of the siloxane chains (A) can have any structure as long as the resulting silicones remain fluid at room temperature and do not substantially form a complex with cyclodextrin. Each R group preferably is alkyl, hydroxy, or hydroxyalkyl group, and mixtures thereof, having less than about 8, preferably less than about 6 carbon atoms, more preferably, each R group is methyl, ethyl, propyl, hydroxy group, and mixtures thereof, most preferably each R group is methyl. Aryl, alkylaryl and/or arylalkyl groups are not preferred. Each A group which blocks the ends of the silicone chain is hydrogen, methyl, methoxy, ethoxy, hydroxy, propoxy, and mixtures thereof, preferably methyl. q is preferably an integer from about 7 to about 8,000. The preferred silicones are polydimethyl siloxanes; more preferred silicones are polydimethyl siloxanes having a viscosity of from about 10 to about 1000,000 centistokes at 25.degree. C. Mixtures of volatile silicones and non-volatile polydimethyl siloxanes are also preferred. Trinh et al. also teach all of the formulas recited in claim 3, in col.29-30.

Regarding claims 60-73, Trinh et al. teach various shape retention polymers, surfactants, antimibrobials as recited in the instant claims. See col.30-31 and col.20. Trinh et al. teach nonlimiting examples of useful anionic antimicrobials/preservatives which are enhanced by aminocarboxylate chelators are sorbic acid and potassium sorbate. Nonlimiting examples of useful nonionic antimicrobials/preservatives which are potentiated by aminocarboxylate chelators are DMDM hydantoin, phenethyl alcohol, monolaurin, imidazolidinyl urea, and Bronopol (2-bromo-2-nitropropane-1,3-diol). Examples of useful phenolic antimicrobials/preservatives potentiated by these chelators are chloroxylenol, phenol, tert-butyl hydroxyanisole, salicylic acid, resorcinol, and sodium o-phenyl phenate. For added odor absorption, Trinh et al. teach various metal salts encompassing those recited by claim 70.

Regarding claims 74-76 and 78-88, Trinh et al. teach that the cyclodextrin composition be used in an article of manufacture. See col. 40 where Trinh et al. teach that the article of manufacture comprises a spray dispenser. The cyclodextrin composition is placed into a spray dispenser in order to be distributed onto the fabric. Said spray dispenser for producing a spray of liquid droplets can be any of the manually activated means as is known in the art, e.g. trigger-type, pump-type, non-aerosol self-pressurized, and aerosol-type spray means, for treating the odor-absorbing composition to small fabric surface areas and/or small articles, as well as non-manually operated, powered sprayers for conveniently treating the odor-absorbing composition to large fabric surface areas and/or a large number of garments and/or articles. The spray dispenser herein does not normally include those that will substantially foam the clear,

aqueous odor absorbing composition. It has been found that the performance is increased by providing smaller particle droplets. Desirably, the Sauter mean particle diameter is from about 10 .mu.m to about 120 .mu.m, more preferably, from about 20 .mu.m to about 100 .mu.m. Dewrinkling benefits are improved by providing small particles (droplets), as discussed hereinbefore, especially when the surfactant is present. See col.40-44.

Accordingly, the broad teachings of Trinh et al. appear to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims.

Applicant's urge that Trinh et al. do not teach a composition comprising oligosaccharide component with a cyclodextrin. However contrary to applicant's arguments, Trinh et al. teach that the term "cyclodextrin" includes any of the known cyclodextrins such as unsubstituted cyclodextrins containing from six to twelve glucose units, especially, alpha-cyclodextrin, beta-cyclodextrin, gamma-cyclodextrin and/or their derivatives and/or mixtures thereof. The alpha-cyclodextrin consists of six glucose units, the beta-cyclodextrin consists of seven glucose units, and the gamma-cyclodextrin consists of eight glucose units. See col.7, ln.1-15. Thus, the teachings of Trinh et al. encompass oligosaccharides since oligosaccharides are simply carbohydrates consisting of three to ten sugar molecules (simple sugars) and Trinh et al. teach cyclodextrins containing from six to twelve glucose units.

18. Claims 52-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trinh et al. (US 6,001,343). Trinh et al. are relied upon as set forth above. However, do

not teach the degree of polymerization of the isomaltooligosaccharide, as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a fabric care composition comprising isomaltooligosaccharide oligosaccharide having the degree of polymerization of the oligosaccharide, as recited by the instant claims, because the teachings of Trinh et al. illustrate a fabric care composition comprising various oligosaccharides having a degree of polymerization of 1 to 14 in general.

19. Claims 49, 54-56, 60-63, 69, 71-73, 76, 79, 84-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Burzio et al. (US 5,496,494).

Burzio et al. teach a process for decreasing the build-up of inorganic incrustations on textiles derived from water hardness and due to repeated washing cycles with the washing bath comprising a non-reducing carbohydrate and/or non-reducing carbohydrate derivative as co-builder. The co-builders used according to the present invention are preferably non-reducing di-, tri- or oligo-saccharides and/or hydrogenated mono-, di- or oligo-saccharides. See abstract and col.1, ln.35-40.

Specifically regarding claims 49, 54-56, 60-63, and 69, Burzio et al. teach representative examples of non-reducing carbohydrate derivatives include glycerol, erythritol, threitol, xylitol, arabitol, ribitol, sorbitol, mannitol, galactitol, tallitol, allitol, altritol, iditol, gulitol, heptitols, anhydrohexitols, maltitol, lactitol, maltotritol, palatinit, alkyl glucosides, alkyl-polyglucosides, hydrogenated leucrose, hydrogenated glucose syrup,

hydrogenated maltose syrup, hydrogenated invert sugar, hydrogenated high fructose syrups, and mixtures thereof. The cobuilders are preferably the so-called sugar alcohols, particularly sugar alcohols having the general formula HOCH.sub.2 (CHOH).sub.n CH.sub.2 OH where n has a value from 2 to 5 inclusive. Particularly preferred are the hexitols specially sorbitol or mannitol. Mixtures of sugar alcohols may also be used e.g. mixtures of sorbitol and mannitol and mixtures known as hydrogenated starch hydrolysates which contain sorbitol, maltitol, maltotriitol and higher oligomers. The co-builders preferably are hexitols, such as sorbitol and/or mannitol; or sucrose and/or glycerol.

Specifically regarding claims 71-73, Burzio et al. teach that the composition may also contain usual components such as anionic, non-ionic, cationic or amphoteric surfactants, alkali metal salts (e.g. sodium carbonate, sodium silicate), neutral salts (e.g. sodium sulphate), zeolite, bleaching agents, bleaching activators and minor ingredients. In accordance with one preferred embodiment of the present invention the co-builders are used in combination with zeolite-based detergents. The co-builders used according to the present invention are particularly efficacious in the presence of inorganic persalts, such as sodium perborate tetrahydrate or monohydrate. The amount of the co-builders used in the process can vary from 1 g/washing cycle to 40 g/washing cycle, and preferably from 2 g/washing cycle to 20 g/washing cycle. This amount is comprised within the range of from 0,5% to 20% and preferably comprised within the range of from 1% to 10%, expressed as 100% dry substance of the detergent or antiincrustating compositions. The co-builders used according to the present invention are naturally

derived, biodegradable compounds. In combination with detergents they reduce the build up of inorganic incrustations on fabrics and on washing machine components. Such activity is more significant at high temperatures e.g. at 90.degree. C. Regarding claims 76, 79, 84-88, Burzio et al. illustrate in examples 1-7, fabric care compositions comprising oligosaccharides as recited by the instant claims. Accordingly, the broad teachings of Burzio et al. appear to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims.

Alternatively, even if the broad teachings of Burzio et al. are not sufficient to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims, it would have been nonetheless obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to arrive at a composition comprising oligosaccharide component with a cyclodextrin. The term "cyclodextrin" is a cyclic oligomer of alpha-D-glucopyranose. The most common cyclodextrins are alpha, beta and gamma cyclodextrin having 6, 7 and 8 glucopyranoseunits respectively. Oligosaccharides are simply carbohydrates consisting of three to ten sugar molecules (simple sugars). Thus, the teachings of Burzio et al. encompass cyclodextrin since Burzio et al. teach various carbohydrate derivatives specifically alkyl glucosides which encompass dextrans and dextrins (branched poly--D-glucosides of microbial origin having glycosidic bonds).

20. Claims 50, 52-53, 57-59, 64-68, 70, 74-75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Burzio et al. (US 5,496,494).

Burzio et al. are relied upon as set forth above.

However, Burzio et al. do not teach the degree of polymerization of the oligosaccharide, the specific formulas or ratio of volatile silicone, lithium salt in a fabric care composition as recited by the instant claims.

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a fabric care composition comprising isomaltooligosaccharide oligosaccharide having the degree of polymerization of the oligosaccharide, as recited by the instant claims, because the teachings of Burzio et al. illustrate a fabric care composition comprising maltitol and maltitritol in general. See col.2, ln.20-30.

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to modify the fabric care composition taught by Burzio et al. by replacing the sodium silicate with silicone as recited by the instant claims, because Burzio et al. provides motivation to utilize silicone in general as a fiber lubricant more commonly known as a surfactant.

It would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to formulate a fabric care composition comprising lithium salt as recited by the instant claims, because the teachings of Burzio et al. illustrate a fabric care composition comprising alkali metal salts in general.

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Preeti Kumar whose telephone number is 571-272-1320. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on 571-272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Preeti Kumar
Examiner
Art Unit 1751

PK

Margaret Einsmann

MARGARET EINSMANN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1100